



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

given in experience, but only inferred from certain actually given subjective data within the conscious content. It is obvious, then, that subjectively revealed spacial forms, for instance, inferred to have their real existence in an objective extra-conscious world, have of necessity to conform to subjective space-perception, of which they are—as thus actually experienced—sense-compelled determinations. (87-88).

“In cultured communities, social conduct and social development have become the chief concern of humanized existence. (90) . . . And here justice and benevolence reveal themselves as the leading principles that make for progressive humanization, and for realization of the social ideal. This ideal of social solidarity is conceived as a state, in which all humanity is imagined to share in the benefactions of a rationally and ethically cultured life. (91)

“Liberty, Equality, Fraternity are sublime watchwords to steadfastly remind us of the far-off humanitarian goal. But that goal cannot be reached before a great majority of individuals composing the social community have constitutionally attained a degree of humanization that renders them socially congenial and capable of consistently performing the duties involved in the realization of the ideal state” (92).

THE CHRIST MYTH OF DREWS.

The object of this book¹ is to prove that the Jesus Christ of Christianity is a pre-Christian Hebrew sun- and fire-god by the name of Jesus, identical with Joshua, Elijah, John the Baptist and other assumed Hebrew forms of these gods, whom the writers of the New Testament transformed into a human being, represented as having lived in the first century of our era under the name of Jesus, though such an historical Jesus never existed.

In order to prove that there was such a pre-Christian God the author presents to the reader, especially in the first part “The pre-Christian Jesus” but also in the second part “The Christian Jesus”, an enormous amount of information and material taken from the comparative study of ancient religions. The facts given in this way will be of great value even to the reader who can not follow the author in the final conclusions he draws from them, for they show how many different pre-Christian conceptions and ideas, mythical,

¹ *The Christ Myth*. By Arthur Drews. Translated from the third edition (revised and enlarged) by C. Delisle Burns. Open Court Pub. Co., 1910.

mystical, ritualistic, sacrificial, speculative, etc., from Pagan and Jewish sources entered into the formation of the Christian Christ-idea. Whether we follow the author or not in his final conclusions, we must fully agree with him that the Christ myth, the idea of a dying and risen saviour-god who brings life and immortality out of death, is rooted deeply and firmly in the many pre-Christian ideas of the kind just mentioned and is a natural outgrowth of them.

The author shows that Parseeism influenced Judaism deeply in regard to the Saviour and Messiah idea; that even far distant India may have furnished material both from the side of Vedic and Buddhist religion; that other religions of antiquity such as those of ancient Babylonia and Egypt furnished the same idea, though in different ways, of the dying and resurrected god, at bottom the yearly waning of the sun and the death of vegetation either by winter in more northern, or by the dry season in more southern climates and its revival in the spring; he shows also that the actual human sacrifices, in order to assist nature in its revivification, or the bloodless imitation ceremonies in connection with the early festivals of the dying and resurrected god, entered into the idea of the Christian Christ; he shows that much mythical, mystical and speculative language of exactly the same terms in Mithraism, Mandaicism and other cults entered into the religious language of Christianity regarding its Christ and the relations of believers to him; he shows the influence of Parsee, Vedic, Buddhist and Greek metaphysical thought in the formation of Christian metaphysical ideas, the idea of the divine wisdom, the divine word or the Logos, standing as a mediator between the far-away God and his creation, a kind of emanation or sonship of God becoming incarnate; he shows that Christianity in fact furnished nothing new whatever in the ethical sphere and that the highest moral thought of Christianity is to be found previously both in Judaism and paganism; that the picture of the ideal, perfect, just, suffering man, as we have it in Christianity, is furnished likewise by Plato and Seneca; he shows that the ideas of the union of man with God through sacred rites, baptism, sacred meals, etc., such as we have in Christianity, were deeply rooted in pre-Christian customs; he shows how strong was the pre-Christian idea of propitiatory death, in that even the death of martyrs dying for their religion as in the Maccabean insurrection was considered redemptive for the whole people; in short the author furnishes in a very skilful way such an enormous amount of valuable material showing what a host of different ideas entered into

the formation of Christianity to make it a thoroughly syncretic religion, that the reader is fully repaid thereby for acquiring the book.

The writer of *The Christ Myth* might have added other strong arguments for the syncretical character of Christianity and its out-growth from previous thought. When speaking of Philo and his influence upon the Fourth Gospel he might have shown how the letter to the Hebrews is still more thoroughly impregnated by Philo even to exactly the same terminology. When speaking of the dying and resurrected gods of pre-Christian religions and the effects of this thought upon the ancient human mind, he might have shown still more strikingly that this idea of the dying and rising god, referring originally only to processes of nature, was transferred into the purely spiritual and religious sphere. He might have referred to the Egyptian burial liturgy in which occur the following words regarding the deceased: "Not as dead does he go away, but as living; as true as Osiris lives, he also will live; as true as Osiris has not died, he also will not die; as true as Osiris has not been destroyed, he also will not be destroyed." (If instead of "Osiris" we place "Christ" we have a fully Christian burial liturgy). He might have referred to the words of the priest in the Greek mysteries at the height of the mystical cult:

"Be confident, initiates, the God is saved,
And also we from sufferings will be saved."

If it had been more in the interest of the author of *The Christ Myth*, he might also have stated how much of the mythical matter related of the assumed god Jesus, and god-forms identical with him, was also related of historical persons. He might have pointed to the fact that not only Plato, Augustus and others were said to have been divinely-begotten sons of virgins, but that exactly the same story told of Joseph, the father of Jesus, is told of the father of Plato, who did not consummate the marriage with Plato's mother till after the child's birth; that a star appeared at the birth of Augustus and great signs preceded the death of Cæsar; that the Roman senate attempted to prevent the birth of Augustus; that in the apotheosis of a Cæsar witnesses were required to appear before the senate to testify that they had seen the soul of the emperor ascend to heaven; that at the birth of Apollonius of Tyana a chorus of swans sang; and that as late as in the Middle Ages the story of the dying and resurrected god was transferred to Frederick I, Barbarossa, who was to arise and bring again the glory of the old empire.

While, as has been said, the author of *The Christ Myth* places before the reader an enormous amount of valuable material for which we must be grateful, I think exception must be taken to the way in which he states certain assumptions and theories as facts which as yet lack definite proof. For instance, if the author accepts as a basis for his thesis the theories of Winckler and others, that all the heroes of the early Old Testament history from Abraham down to Elijah, and perhaps even further, are nothing but astral, zodiacal, solar and lunar gods, the reviewer in company with many others is willing to yield to this theory to a certain extent, as in the case of Samson where the solar characteristics are clear, even in the name itself (*Shimshon*, "the solar one"). Nevertheless he thinks it would be more cautious and in accordance with facts to assume that, as in the case of the Iliad, Odyssey and the Nibelungenlied, there may likewise be in early Hebrew history a mixture of the purely mythical and historical, nature-myths and early tribal and national history, in which it is sometimes very difficult to separate the purely mythical from the historical characters.

The Joshua (Greek *Jesus*) of the conquest of Canaan may have been a tribal sun-god, but the high priest Joshua who appears in the books of Zechariah and Ezra was surely no god. Likewise, if the Joshua of the conquest was a god, all consciousness of the fact was lost and he was considered an historical person (see 1 Kings xvi. 34), at least during the times of the Exile. Even in the eighth century B. C., as we can gather from such old prophets as Amos, Hosea and Micah, the history of the conquest as we find it in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua was accepted. Micah vi. 7 speaks of Moses, Aaron and Miriam (the latter of whom Drews erroneously considers a sister of Joshua, see page 117) as historical persons, not as gods.

The patriarch Joseph may likewise have been a tribal sun-god, but it is very questionable whether when the Gospels represented Jesus as a son of the carpenter Joseph, a myth was still known, if ever such a one existed, relating that this sun-god Joseph was an artisan, i. e., a "world modeller" (p. 114) as in the case of the father of Agni, the god of fire, and Kinyras, the father of Adonis, where the sun-myth is entirely transparent.

If Elijah is a sun-god, his contemporary Ahab at least is historical and well attested by the Moabite stone. Elijah appears to me rather to be a genuine Oriental religious zealot. The miracles related of him and his final fiery ascension to heaven do not disprove

his historical character. Similar things are related of Mohammedan marabouts even to-day, and the miracles told about Empedocles, a character somewhat similar to Elijah in his stand against the mighty and his marvelous end, do not stamp him therefore as unhistorical. Further, to connect Elijah etymologically with *Helios* (sun) will only appeal to those ignorant of ancient languages and philological laws. And finally Elijah has played an important rôle as an historical prophet in Jewish literature, in the Gospels and the Talmud in connection with the Messianic hopes ever since Malachi iv. 5.

John the Baptist is to Drews another form of the sun-god. As he does not occur in the Old Testament, "under the name *Johannes* is concealed the Babylonian water-god *Oannes* (Ea)," another form of the sun-god, i. e., "the sun begins its yearly course with a baptism, entering after its birth the constellation of the Water-carrier and the Fishes" (p. 122).

As John the Baptist occurs in Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII, 5, 2) this passage is declared a Christian interpolation on the authority of the Jewish writer Graetz, though his authority is rejected when declaring the *Vita Contemplativa* of Philo a Christian forgery (p. 51). Whether Graetz declared the Baptist passage an interpolation because he considered John unhistorical is not said, nor is an appeal in this connection to a note in Schürer (*Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, etc.) more illuminating. I have read Schürer on Josephus in Herzog and Plitt's latest edition and find in his discussion of interpolations in Josephus not the least word on the passage of the Baptist. I am sure that to Schürer John is historical.

We ought to be extremely careful in declaring passages interpolated. Preconceived theories ought not to influence our judgment in this respect in the least. No one has a right to declare passages interpolated unless on the fact that they are wanting in some manuscripts, or on grounds which thoroughly show that they are imported foreign matter. If the passage on the Baptist (known to Celsus before 180) is a Christian interpolation, the interpolator must have been entirely ignorant of the accounts about the Baptist in the Gospels, for these contradict the Josephus passage in many respects and are written from an entirely different viewpoint.

In connection with John the Baptist the philology regarding the river Jordan² will again only appeal to those who base comparative philology on the similarity of sounds instead of on scientific prin-

² "*Eridanus*, the heavenly Jordan or year-stream (Egyptian *iaro* or *iero*, the river)" (p. 122).

ciples. This kind of philology occurring in so many places in *The Christ Myth* is one of the weakest points in the book and ought to be removed in future editions. Likewise if the method were correct that Drews applies to Hebrew names in which the word *El* (God) occurs, not one of the host of names for persons in the Old Testament containing *El* would signify a human being, but each would signify a god. (Compare on page 77: "*Israel*, the mighty God," "the earliest designation of the God of the Hebrews until displaced by *Yahveh*." A very questionable assertion!) Likewise, according to the same method, if all names for human beings, in which the syllable *jah* or *jeho* (abbreviation for *Yahveh*) occurs, would signify a god, there would be no end of such gods in the Old Testament. (Compare *Jehoshua* considered as a god.) It is to me extremely doubtful whether the very frequent names in the Old Testament in which the syllables *el* or *jah* or *jeho* appear would ever have been used for the designation of a god. According to the method applied by Drews we might with the same right consider Merodach Baladan, a king of Babylonia (Is. xxxix. 1) a god, but that name simply means "Merodach is ruler and lord."

It also seems to me incomprehensible that if *Jehoshua* were such a noted sun-god of the Hebrews we do not see the least trace or mention of his cult in the Old Testament or elsewhere in Jewish literature, while the cults of Tammuz, Moloch, Baal Peor, Cemosh and other gods, surely all different forms of the sun-god, are mentioned. But Drews furnishes direct proofs that *Joshua* or *Jesus* was a pre-Christian Hebrew god. *Jesus* is not only a sun-god but also a god of healing and saving (p. 58) identical with the Greek *Jasios* or *Jason*, i. e., "the healer," (another example of the weak philology of the book) and is mentioned as such in ancient documents. But Hebraists know that *Joshua* or *Jesus* means no such a thing as "healer" or "saviour." The Hebrew for "physician" is *rophe*,³ and for "saviour" *moshia*,⁴ a hiphil participial form of the verb *jasha*, often occurring in the Old Testament as an attribute of God, as in the Greek *Zeus Soter*.

But what about the ancient documents? In a Parisian magic papyrus published by Wessely (line 3119 etc.), we read the words, "I exhort thee by *Jesus* the God of the Hebrews." While Drews considers this papyrus to be of pre-Christian times, other scholars say that it appears to date from the first half of the fourth century A. D., and that if in it *Jesus* is called the "God of the Hebrews,"

מושיע * צֶדֶק רָפָא †

this does not necessarily point to a pre-Christian time but may just as well be due to Christian influence, in that Jesus is mistakenly conceived to be a god of the Hebrews by some conjurer; that just as the name of Solomon was made use of in conjurations (compare Josephus *Ant.* VIII, 2, 5) so the name Jesus was made use of not only by Christians but also by others who conceived his name to be powerful (compare Acts xix. 14).

The existence of the pre-Christian god Jesus is also assumed on the basis of another document. The great heresy expert Epiphanius (4th century A. D.) says in a very muddled way:⁵ "Upon these follow in order the *Nazoraioi*, who belong to the same time as they and who, whether existing before them or with them or after them, nevertheless are their contemporaries; for I can no longer tell exactly who followed the others. For they were, exactly as I said, contemporaries and had similar thoughts. But they did not attribute to themselves the name of Christ or Jesus but that of the *Nazoraioi*, and all Christians then were called likewise *Nazoraioi*. But it happened a short time before that they were called *Jessaioi* before they began to call the disciples of Jesus in Antioch Christians. And they were as I think called *Jessaioi* on account of Jesse. They either were called *Jessaioi* after Jesse the father of David or after the name of Jesus our Lord, because they went out from Jesus as disciples or because this is the etymology of the name of the Lord. For Jesus means in Hebrew the same as *therapeutes*, i. e., physician and saviour. Before they were called Christians they were called by this name somehow as a surname. From Antioch as said above, they began to call the disciples and the whole church of God Christians, but some called themselves *Nasaraioi* for the heresy of the *Nasaraioi* existed even before Christ and did not know anything of him. But all called the Christians *Nazoraioi* as also the accusers of the apostle do."

From this passage and a few more words in the above-mentioned magical papyrus reading (line 1549): "I conjure you by the *mar-parkourith nasaari*" and from the mention of the words *Jesus Nazarja* in a hymn of the Naassene sect, Drews, following Professor William Benjamin Smith of Tulane University in all this, draws the conclusion that there were two pre-Christian sects called *Jessaioi* and *Nazoraioi* who were closely related to each other, if not abso-

⁵ The following quotation from *Panar. Haer.*, XXIX, 6, is not given by Drews.

lutely identical (p. 59). They were so called from the divinity they adored, *Jesus Nasarja*, meaning the "saviour-protector."

To strengthen this assumption and the claim that the Christian sect of the *Nazoraioi* in the New Testament were not called thus from the home of Jesus, Nazareth, the existence of Nazareth in the first century is questioned on doubts raised in the article "Nazareth" in *Enc. Bibl.* (The exceedingly slim grounds for the non-existence of Nazareth in the first century I have exposed in my article, "Nazareth, Nazorean and Jesus," *Open Court*, June 1910).

In answer to the assumed *Nazarja* divinity identical with the god *Jesus*, and his adorers, the *Nazoraioi*, the following is to be said: The form *Nazarja* occurring in the hymn of the Christian gnostic sect of the Naassenes (who knew the Fourth Gospel and therefore were no pre-Christian sect) is nothing but the Syrian or Aramaic form for the Greek *Nazoraios* in the New Testament, i. e., "he of Nazareth." This is proved by the Syrian translation of the New Testament. The Syrian *Nazarja* has nothing whatever to do with the Hebrew *Nazarjah*, "one whom Yahveh guards," (note the difference in the spelling of the last syllable in both forms). Another form, which Drews cites as identical with the Syrian *Nazarja*, and which occurs in the Talmud, namely *nozri*, also has nothing to do with the idea of protector. This form *nozri* is simply a Hebrew form denoting descent, i. e., "he of Nazareth," just as *Thimni* (Jud. xv. 10) means "one from Thimnatha" and *Beth-ha Shimshi* (1 Sam. vi. 14) "He from Beth Shemesh." The Syrian *Nazarja* and the Hebrew *Nozri* both mean the same as the Greek *Nazoraios* of the New Testament, "he of Nazareth." Nevertheless the strongest blow which this whole pre-Christian *Jesus Nasarja* saviour-protector-divinity receives is the one dealt by Aramaic scholars, who say that at the times of Jesus the Palestinian Jews did not use the Hebrew verb *nazar* for "to guard" but the Aramaic *ne'tar*. In reproducing the theory of Professor Smith, Drews unconsciously weakens it (p. 59) by appealing to the "protector of Israel" (Ps. cxxi. 4) to prove that *Nazarja* means protector. Drews does not notice that in the Hebrew of that passage not the verb *nazar* but *shamar* is used which also means "protect." This bad mistake, which of course one ignorant of the original text does not notice, ought to be corrected in future editions. The whole passage of Epiphanius speaks for *Nazaraioi* as being the earliest name of the Christians rather than that of a pre-Christian sect, especially since it clearly distinguishes between *Nazoraioi* and the pre-Christian *Nasaraioi*, who according

to him rejected the Pentateuch and were vegetarians. The passage of Epiphanius and the other documents mentioned above afford at least a very uncertain basis upon which to build such a theory of a pre-Christian *Jesus-Nazarja* divinity.

But to another point. In bringing before the reader the extensive material from the comparative study of religion to prove his thesis, we notice that the author does not always distinguish sharply between earlier and later customs and ideas of Christianity. Nevertheless this ought to be done when we attempt to trace the first beginnings of Christianity. If Drews adduces "the Magi or kings" (p. 94) as the three stars in the sword-belt of Orion, we must remember that the Gospel speaks neither of kings nor of three persons and that the legend of the three kings is a very much later legend whose foundation on pagan myths we of course would not in the least dispute.

When speaking of Christian baptism and tracing its origin back to fire-worship (p. 119) the author says the Greek name for baptism is *photismos*, "enlightenment," but we must remember that in the New Testament no such a term is used for baptism though later ecclesiastical writers call catechumens expecting baptism soon, *photizomenoi*, without surely any thought of fire-worship.

On page 89 the flight of Mary into Egypt on an ass with the child Jesus is traced back to pictorial representations of the flight of the son of Isis on an ass out of Egypt, and here we must again remember that nothing of all this occurs in Matthew and that very probably the whole myth of the flight to Egypt is based on the allegorical use of Hosea xi. 1, the people of Israel, the son of Yahveh, being taken as the type of the Messiah.

The martyrdom of Stephen is traced back and according to Drews is made to rest on the constellation of Corona (Greek, *Stephanos*) becoming visible on the eastern horizon about Christmas (St. Stephen's day, December 26) but we must remember that both the December 25th as the birthday of Christ and the following day as the date of the martyrdom of Stephen are very, very much later institutions of the church.

Drews further connects the expression *Agnus Dei* (lamb of God) etymologically with the fire-god Agni and says that it is nothing else than *Agni Deus* (p. 145), but here he forgets that *Agnus Dei* is the later Latin translation of the Greek ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (John i. 29) and not the original expression.

When the cross of Christ is brought into connection with the

ancient fire-cross and other symbols, the author unconsciously admits that this comparison is not justifiable, since he himself rightly shows that the term *stauros* in the New Testament does not mean "cross" but simply "stake" and that marks of nails are first mentioned in the late Gospel of John (p. 147). It is doubtful whether Jesus was nailed to the cross, and even if he was fastened by nails, the cross was not necessarily of the shape $+$ but may have been of the Γ shape which form the early so-called Epistle of Barnabas assumes, whose composition Drews places much earlier than the Gospel of John, even towards the end of the first century (p. 220). The author therefore has also no right to say that "the Saviour carrying his cross is copied from Hercules (Simon of Cyrene), bearing the pillars crosswise" (p. 241). If Drews shows that criminals in the time of Jesus were simply bound to the stake and left to die, what has the carrying of the stake to do with Hercules bearing the pillars "crosswise"? That condemned criminals had to bear the stake to the place of execution is related by classical writers.⁶ By the way if Simon of Cyrene is Hercules how does Drews explain that this Simon is said in Mark xv. 21 to be the father of Alexander and Rufus, persons of whom we know absolutely nothing, but who must have been well known in the Christian community where this incident was first related?

Some other strictures might be made concerning the method employed of using ideas and facts of very much later date than the times of the origin of Christianity, as for instance the use made of the Talmudic double Messiah, the Messiah ben Joseph and Messiah ben David (p. 80) corresponding as is said (p. 81) to the Haman and Mordecai of the Jewish Purim feast. Concerning the custom at this festival of executing one criminal, Haman, and releasing the other, Mordecai, under the mask of which custom Frazer believes that a Jewish teacher by the name of Jesus may have been executed, and which Drews accepts as an absolutely certain custom among the Jews, making much of it in favor of his thesis, we have not the least trace in Jewish literature nor proof of its existence. The Purim festival as we know it among the Jews is based entirely upon a romance, the Book of Esther, and of so late a date that it is not mentioned in the text-books of Hebrew archeology where all the other Hebrew festivals are treated extensively in regard to their origin. The writer of that tale undoubtedly brought the fictitious incident he relates into connection with some Persian or Babylonian

⁶ Cic., *De divin.*, I, 26; Valer. Max. XI, 7 and others.

custom or festival (ix. 19 etc.) but he evidently did not know anything certain about the meaning of the word *Pur*, which he translates "lot," though there is no such word for "lot" in Persian.⁷ Zimmern assumes the Purim feast to be of Babylonian origin, the New Year festival on which the gods under the presiding Marduk cast lots in an assembly (*puhru*) regarding the fate of the next year. If the custom to which Drews refers existed so late in history among the Jews, the meaning of it must have been totally lost to them, or else the author of Esther could not, as far as I can see, have tacked his story to it. Some commentators are inclined to believe that the Book of Esther was written by one of the many Jews in Mesopotamia or Persia. The book itself only came into the canon under very strong protest because of the ugliness of its extreme fanaticism.

The author of *The Christ Myth* surely makes very skilful use of many assumptions which he gives out as well proven facts in favor of his thesis, but it is doubtful whether in the long run they will stand the test. How careless the author is in making use of material in his favor without testing it, is shown on page 79, where he follows an interpretation of Dan. ix. 26, which the staunchest orthodoxy has followed for 1800 years, but which scientific investigation has rejected for over a century, and which even the neo-Platonist Porphyry and a Christian writer Julius Hilarianus of the fourth century had rejected. I refer to the orthodox interpretation that in this passage reference is made to the dying Christ. All scientific investigators refer it to the death of some historical personality, such as Alexander the Great, Seleucus Philopator or Onias III. The author is often too credulous in accepting his material and therefore too quick in suppositions, as when he lumps together all the different Marys of the New Testament, the mother of Jesus, the Magdalene, the mother of James the Less and Joses into the twofold form of the mother and the "beloved in the sexual sense of the word," of the God *Jasius* or *Joshua* (p. 117); or when he suspects the *Alpha* and *Omega* of Revelation to be concealed in *Ao* (*Aoos*) said to be a Greek form for *Adonis*, while philologists consider this latter form as probably the Doric *aos* for Attic *eos*, "the dawn"; or when he suspects Golgotha as being a site of ancient Adonis worship, because Golgos is said according to some scholia to have been a son of Adonis and Aphrodite, while Golgotha (Hebrew *Gulgoleth* = skull)

⁷ Cornill, *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, p. 140.

may very simply only refer to the skull-shaped locality of the execution of Jesus.

* * *

Going over to the second part of the book, "The Christian Jesus," we fully agree with the author that without Paul Christianity would have remained a very restricted faith and would have made but little progress. The author clearly sees the important and dominant part which Paul took in the rising Christianity. He gives a very good description of Paul's metaphysics, his doctrine of sin and redemption, his mystical ideas of the union of God and man through Christ, and the magical power of baptism and the Lord's Supper, etc. Still, if "the information the Acts give as to Paul's life is for the most part mere fiction" (p. 166) and if all the Pauline letters are so extremely doubtful (p. 166 f.) regarding their authenticity as the author assumes, we can not very well understand why such an extended use is made of these letters in proving the thesis of the book, and why any passages in them running contrary to it are declared interpolations. If the letters were written "by a whole school of second century theologians" we should not expect that there would be much necessity for interpolations later. At least so it seems to the writer.

We also do not understand why, if the Acts are so very untrustworthy, so much use is made of them to prove the existence of a widely spread cult of the pre-Christian god, Jesus. From Acts xviii. 25 and other passages in the Acts, the conclusion is drawn that the preaching about Jesus of Apollos and others who knew only the baptism of John the Baptist, was a teaching about the pre-Christian god Jesus. Others who take the words of the Acts regarding the preaching of Apollos as the author of Acts meant them, simply see in the fact of Apollos knowing only of the baptism of John a proof that Jesus did not himself institute a special baptism as the last words of Matthew give it (evidently a later addition betraying itself by the formula "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost") and that the baptism in the name of Jesus was only gradually introduced by the growing primitive church. The Acts surely contain many inaccurate statements, but the "we" passages incorporated into their second part at least seem to bear the stamp of genuineness. These even contain a mention of James, (xxi. 18) whom Paul (Gal. i. 19) calls "the (definite article, not a) brother of the Lord," evidently meaning a close relation to Jesus,

no spiritual brother or follower.⁸ What Jerome, a zealous advocate of the perpetual virginity of the mother of Jesus, said a few centuries later about this James, does not count.

As concerning the Acts, so also with regard to the authenticity of the Pauline letters we do not wish to start a long discussion. We will restrict ourselves to the following: Drews places the epistle of Clement of Rome at the end of the first century (p. 220). Now this letter mentions the first letter to the Corinthians by name (xlvii) referring to the dissensions in Corinth, discussed in the first chapter, and to Apollos and Kephass (the latter by the way seems to be considered a legendary character by Drews, according to the preface p. 20). Further, the letter of Clement has passages which remind us of passages in the letter to the Romans; it has passages which occur verbatim in the letter to the Hebrews (non-Pauline, but strongly testifying also to the humanity of Jesus, v. 7). I may just mention in connection here that Clement, of whom Drews says that he "is completely silent as to the Gospels," twice cites words which he attributes to Jesus, occurring in the Gospels (XLVI & XIII). To close my remarks on the authenticity of the Pauline letters, I will say that to me the extremely passionate, polemical, personal and individualistic character at least of the letters to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians and Philippians seems to be the strongest proof for their authenticity. I do not see how second century theologians could ever have invented this. Could Paul's pathetic wish (Rom. ix. 1), for instance, to be accursed for the sake of his people, ever have been invented by second century theologians, when the complete separation of Christianity from Judaism had long been an established fact?

Now to some points in "The Pauline Jesus."

"The form in which Paul grasped Christianity was that of an incarnation of God" says Drews on page 189. Still this form and representation of Paul's religion in his letters does not refer to any historical Jesus in which this incarnation took place. All that seems to look like this is mere phantom. Though the words seem to point to a human Jesus, they do not mean this. "It was not unusual among the heathen peoples for a man to be crucified in place of the Deity as a symbolical representative; although already at the time of Paul it was the custom to represent the self-sacrificing God only by an effigy, instead of a real man. The important point, however,

⁸ The brothers of Jesus in 1 Cor. ix. 5 and mentioned by name in the Gospels are allegorized into "followers of the religion of Jesus" (p. 172).

was not this, but the idea which lay at the foundation of this divine sacrifice" (p. 188). "When Paul designated the Messiah Jesus as a bodily descendant of David according to the flesh, born of woman, he thought not at all of any concrete individuality which had at a certain time embodied the divinity within itself but purely of the idea of a Messiah in the flesh" (p. 190). All have thought thus far that the designations just mentioned "from the seed of David according to the flesh," "born of woman," and others, "born under the law," "delivered over in the last night," "crucified," "buried," "seen after death by his disciples" etc., occurring in the Pauline letters referred to an historical personality, but according to Drews they mean nothing of the kind. If any passages seem to speak too definitely about some historical personality Jesus, such as the above mentioned passage in Galatians which mentions "the brother of the Lord," or the passage in 1 Corinthians about the delivering of Jesus in the last night, or the passage on the different appearances of the Lord after his death in 1 Cor. xv, a passage which even a David Strauss considered as the oldest account of the visions the disciples had of their master, these passages are declared later interpolations. All that seems to point to an historical Jesus, says Drews, is as historical as what was said of the redeemers Hercules and Mithras (p. 178). Yet these were believed to have lived in antiquity while Paul refers to a person with whose disciples and brothers he had come into personal contact; and while Hercules is the offspring of Zeus and a human woman, and Mithra is born from the rock, Jesus according to Paul comes simply from the seed of David and is born of a woman.

When Drews in several places in his book speaks of the deification of other human persons in history; when he mentions Jewish gnostic sects, who imagined the Messiah to have become incarnate in Adam, Enoch, Abraham, and so on, finally to become incarnate in Jesus (p. 112); when he says that "the guiltless martyrdom of an upright man as expiatory means to the justification of his people was also not unknown to the adherents of the Law since the days of the Maccabean martyrs"; when he says "a captive criminal was looked upon as an imitation of the God sacrificing himself" (p. 188); it is hard to see why after all this he goes to the trouble of attempting to prove that there was no historical Jesus who could have been deified and considered a divine incarnation, and whose death could be taken as an expiatory death for mankind. Drews does not seem to consider at all that these possibilities could have

been further supported by the fact that Jesus very probably thought himself specifically and divinely chosen for his work and made claims which moved his followers to exalt him to a divinely sent saviour and redeemer. The author of *The Christ Myth* criticizes liberal theology for assuming "ecstatic visionary experiences" and "pathological states of over-excited men and hysterical women" among the causes of the historical foundation of Christianity (p. 268). But are these assumptions so very unreasonable? It is a well-known fact that in religion reason plays a very much less important rôle than feeling, and in the foundation of the great religions of the world the ecstatic, abnormal, and pathological states of mind of their founders have always been a very important factor. A. Meyer (*The Resurrection of Christ*) says: "Visions are in certain periods of history the necessary form of religious revelation. A visionary disposition possesses many morbid elements but in great men it is an heroic sickness."

But my review is already too long. I will therefore restrict myself to the remaining questions and remarks which further occurred as important to me while reading the book. I will give these as they occurred to me consecutively in reading the remainder of "The Pauline Jesus" and the following chapter, "The Jesus of the Gospels," without any special order, since each question or remark is independent of any of the other remarks or questions.

I may be mistaken, but is it probable (p. 186) that the first Christian missionaries in Antioch made any compromise with the more or less voluptuous Adonis cult? Paul in his letters at least does not speak in any very accommodating way of heathen cults.

If Antioch is rather the birthplace of Christianity and the spreading of Christianity did not start from Jerusalem (p. 210), why then does Paul so often return to Jerusalem, not only according to the Acts, but also according to his letters, keeping up his connection with the mother church and supporting it by collections from the churches he founded?

Is not the reiterated statement of Paul that he had seen the Lord (of course in a vision) upon which he bases his apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 1 and other places) as well as the older apostles in Judea, and at the same time the antagonism of his evangelization methods to the older apostles who considered themselves the more privileged as having stood nearer to the master, a proof of the existence of a Jesus, who had given no hint whatever as to the methods to be followed regarding pagan believers, and had con-

centrated all his efforts to the salvation of his own people in expectation of the near end?

Has our author, who places *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* so very early, "perhaps even at the end of the first century" (p. 220), ever read this work? He claims that it speaks of a Jesus-God "in no wise the same as the Christian redeemer" (p. 62) and that it "cites Christ's words, such as stand in the Gospels, but not as sayings of Jesus." It seems to me that if this work when giving thanks to God for the eucharist repeatedly speaks of Jesus as "thy servant Jesus, through whom thou hast revealed to us life, knowledge and immortality, etc.," this does not sound very much as if referring to a Jesus-God. Besides this it *does* cite such words as those standing in the Gospels as sayings of the Lord, i. e., Jesus (VIII, 2; IX, 5). Evidently Robertson too on whom Drews depends had not read this work thoroughly. It is always better to search independently.

The same may be said of the secular testimonies concerning early Christianity, those of Tacitus, Pliny, (the passage on the persecution under Nero in Suetonius is not mentioned at all). The author rejects all these testimonies as forgeries (pp. 228 and 231). Has he made an independent investigation of all of them? If he had done so he might have found out how exceedingly slim are the grounds on which such authorities as Hochart and others reject these passages. The reviewer at least has experienced this by independent investigation and since that time he has become very suspicious in regard to "authorities." If the testimonies referred to are Christian forgeries, the only grounds for them must have been that the forgers foresaw the modern attacks on the historicity of Jesus, for there were no such reasons for forgery in their own times and what other reasons could have influenced them I do not understand. In regard to the Tacitus passage, on which the main attack is directed, I have asked the very pertinent question, why should just *this* passage be forged, when Sulpicius Severus, who cites it verbatim in regard to the Neronian persecution, also cites the same Tacitus verbatim in regard to other matters *not* dealing with Christianity. (See *Monist*, Jan. 1911).

If Schürer thinks that Josephus may not have meant James the brother of Jesus, (*Ant.* IX, 1) this ground is also not yet decisive.

If Drews cites the hyperbolical words of the so-called Epistle of Barnabas (which he places as early as 96 A. D., p. 220) that Jesus chose his apostles from the worst of sinners to preach his

gospel, in order to prove that he came to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance, adding that this was neither written by an apostle nor one of their pupils (which no one claims), these words at least seem to refer to an historical Jesus. Further they seem indeed "to be written after our Gospels," as they cite words occurring there, and they further do *not* seem to be written "at a time when the learned masters of the church had still a free hand to show their spirit and ingenuity in giving form to the evangelical story." If Drews places this epistle at 96 A. D. and rejects the Tacitus passage as well as the Pliny passage referring to persecutions in Bithynia about 111, how then could there be much of a church with learned masters at that time according to his view? The fact is rather that the critics place the letter of Barnabas about 25 years later, when all the Gospels very probably were in existence.

When Drews wrote "The Jesus of the Gospels," did he think of the strong proofs for an historical Jesus to be found in some of the parables, such as the parable of the evil husbandmen and the parable of the supper which the king made for his son? According to both parables (it does not matter whether Jesus spoke them in the form we have them or whether they were enlarged upon by the Gospel writers) punishment is dealt out to the evil doers, who, it is clearly hinted are meant for the Jewish people. That these parables speak of an historical Jesus, the final and most eminent of the prophets God sent to his disciples, as the parables put it, I should think is clear.

Jesus is a physician-god like Asclepius, on account of the miracles related of him (pp. 240, 264 and also 138). Still if (p. 240) Tacitus and Suetonius are referred to as relating miracles performed by Vespasian of the same nature as those done by Jesus, and "if the Old Testament stand as a model" in this respect, why is Jesus then necessarily a healer-god and not historical?

All along we have been told that Jesus was a pre-Christian God. But on page 246 it is said that the Gospels intentionally invented the deficiencies of Jesus that they record, i. e., temporary inability to do miracles, non-omniscience, moral imperfection, etc., in order "to paint the celestial Christ of Paul for the faithful as a real man and to treat his idea of humanity seriously." Liberal theologians have thus far considered these deficiencies of Jesus as a proof of a historical perfectly human Jesus, and even orthodox theologians look at them as showing how thoroughly God became

man, but now we are told that all this is only ingenious device. Our intelligence is often strongly taxed.

On page 36 Drews rightly says that in the view of a later age primitive gods become men, such as Achilles, Hercules, Siegfried, etc. He then adds that the elevation of men to gods is as a rule only found in the earliest stage of human civilization or in periods of moral or social decay, worthless flattery, etc. Well, were not the later Hellenic times such times, when "a Plato and Aristotle were honored after their death as godlike beings" (p. 267); when important generals and kings and emperors were deified, as also happened to Apollonius of Tyana, a contemporary of Jesus? If "it was merely an expression of personal gratitude and attachment, of overflowing sentiment" (p. 268) to render divine honors to eminent men, why should this not have happened to Jesus? "Primitive gods in a later age become men," it is true, but this process is generally a very long one. It will be hard to make people believe that the Jesus of the New Testament is the outcome of such a process. He springs up suddenly in history and the process of his deification is a comparatively short one and corresponds to the time in which similar processes of deification came about.

The ethical teachings of Jesus are truly (p. 257) no higher than those of other ancient moral teachers, Jewish or pagan, but is not the actual life of Jesus, especially among the lower classes, those looked down upon by the righteous, in order to save them, a good proof of his real humanity? It is just this life of Jesus which seems peculiarly real. Further, is not just the "egoistical pseudo-morals, his basing moral action on the expectation of reward and punishment in the future, his narrow-minded nationalism, his obscure mysticism with mysterious references to his heavenly father, etc." as Drews characterizes the teaching of Jesus (p. 257), a proof for the historical Jesus, or is all this only intentional invention of the Gospels again?

In order to prove his thesis that there is no historical truth in the Gospels and that the impression which Jesus is said to have made upon his time is the impression of a fictitious personage, Drews draws a comparison with Goethe's *Werther*, which produced an enormous impression though entirely fictitious (p. 257). But the great impression made by *Werther* is perhaps due to the concrete realities standing behind it, the suicide of young Jerusalem in consequence of a deep love for the wife of a friend and the inner and outer experiences of Goethe himself.

In the Gospels, and, we may add, the letters of Paul, there is likewise a mixture of historical truth and myth, of concrete reality and inner and outer experience. The tragical career of Jesus is surely not invented, nor is the impression he made upon his followers. According to page 264 "Christ is only another form of the club-gods of religious-social brotherhoods, such as Attis, Adonis, Mithras, etc., with their yearly bloody expiatory sacrifice, baptism of blood, forgiveness of sins and rebirth." But it is to be remarked that if Jesus is only such a club-god, why was not in his case also a yearly bloody expiatory sacrifice and a baptism of blood repeated? The death of the human Jesus was once for all time the death-knell of all such bloody sacrifices and perhaps just because he was human and no club-god.

If according to page 267 it was possible to create out of a pure idea the semblance of a concrete personality that never existed, first by Paul and then more fully by the Gospels and all this in a comparatively short time, why could not the reverse be true, to create out of an historical personality a divine incarnation? The latter process, if we take into consideration the peculiar mental and ecstatic state of the first followers of Jesus and of Paul, seems to us less of "a psychological puzzle" than the former process.

On page 271 we are told that the lowest stratum on which our canonical Gospels are based was a Judaistic literature which had the closest interest in the historical determination of Jesus's life. "Judaism in general and the form of it at Jerusalem in particular, needed a legal title on which to base its commanding position as contrasted with the Gentile Christianity of Paul; and so its founders were obliged to have been companions of Jesus in person and to have been selected for their vocation by him." "In Paul's lifetime the transformation of the Jesus faith into history did not take place as one can believe from his letters." In order to discredit the apostleship of Paul, the Judaists "made the justification for the apostolic vocation consist in this, that an apostle must not only have seen Christ risen but must also have eaten and drunk with him" (p. 270). While liberal theology is inclined to see in the coarse materialization of the appearances of Jesus to his disciples after his death later accretions to the original resurrection story as told in 1 Cor. xv, and this probably in opposition to the Docetics who taught that Jesus had only an apparent, not a real, body, even before his death, Drews thinks that all this was done by Judaistic Christianity with the set purpose of making Jerusalem the central seat

of authority. "For this reason the god Jesus was transformed into an historical individual whose central point of action was Jerusalem" and whose right successors were the Judaistic apostles.

The reviewer must confess that it took him a long time to understand this reasoning of Drews as to why and how the god Jesus was transformed into an historical individual. It is very intricate to see how the god Jesus was made historical and yet was not historical, especially since the author says (p. 272) "that the Pauline epistles themselves contain nothing to lead one to believe that the transformation of the Jesus faith into history took place in Paul's time," while on page 275 he says that "the Pauline Christianity was in earnest with the manhood of Jesus," speaking similarly in earlier pages (p. 191 etc.). It seems then that Paul, like the Judaists who laid the basis for the Gospels, as Drews says, only talked of Jesus as historical though he was not historical. This whole thing seems to me to be one great tangle. The matter becomes still more confused when we read that all this representation of the god Jesus as an historical man, though not historical, was done in order to meet the gnostics of whom Drews says that they "agreed with the Christians that Jesus had been human" (p. 274). If they agreed with the Christians that Jesus was human (I suppose Drews means to say that they represented Jesus as human though he was not human) why then all this trouble of Paul and the Gospels to meet them by making Jesus historical who was not historical?

On pages 278-281, the author speaks of the Fourth Gospel as mainly directed against gnosticism "though itself gnostic but fundamentally differing" from the views it meets by "asserting that the Logos was made flesh." In this connection Drews says: "The historical picture which came down to the writer of the Fourth Gospel was forcibly rectified by him and the personality of Jesus was worked up into something so wonderful, extraordinary and supernatural, that if we were in possession of the Fourth Gospel alone, in all probability the idea would hardly have occurred to any one that it was a treatment of the life-story of an historical individual." This seems to me to be an admission fatal to the theory of Drews, for it is just the great difference between the idealistic Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics and Pauline letters which make us surmise a human, historical Jesus behind the latter.

In the appendix, "The Religious Problem of the Present," the author criticizes much of the language and phraseology of liberal theology, as he also does in other passages throughout the book,

and to my opinion in many cases rightly. He criticizes especially that such liberals speak still of Jesus as "redeemer" and "the voice of God to us." Still when Drews himself says, giving his view of religion: "God must become man, so that man can become God, and be redeemed from the bounds of the finite, etc." (p. 296) and when he speaks of "the divine essence of mankind, the immanent Godhead" as "the inner Christ" to be worked out, etc., his phraseology does not differ very much from that of those he criticizes; perhaps after all he does not differ so much in the essential points of religion from those he criticizes. On page 290 he calls the phraseology of a liberal theologian, A. Meyer, concerning God in connection with Jesus, pantheistic. Yet he himself, speaking of "the tidal wave of naturalism, ever growing more powerful and sweeping away the last vestige of religious thought," thinks that "the sinking fire of religion must be transferred to the ground of pantheism in a religion independent of any ecclesiastical guardianship."

The Christ Myth is a good statement of one of the many present theories that Jesus never existed, and we hope that it may find many readers, in order that the actual truth may be probed to the bottom. But just for this reason it would have been desirable that the author in giving the facts on which he bases his theory, would have been less assertive and would have shown that the facts adduced are really well founded.

A. KAMPMEIER.

IOWA CITY.

RIGNANO'S THEORY OF ACQUIRED CHARACTERISTICS

The transmission of acquired characters from parent to child was an old problem in the days before Darwin when the theories of preformism and epigenesis were pitted against each other. Preformism was also called evolution in the narrow and literal sense of the word, for the life of any creature was assumed to be simply an unfolding of the type latent in the germ. A real chicken, though invisible on account of its diminutive size, was supposed to lie hidden in the egg, while the epigenesis theory explained the successive stages of the life in both the race and the individual by additional growth. The discussion of this same problem was renewed by Weismann, who takes a very uncompromising position against Lamarck's view of the development of life through exercise of organs and specialization by use. Weismann denies altogether the inheri-